UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,049	09/12/2003	Richard D. Cummings	7148.003	7472

30589 7590 03/08/2006

DUNLAP, CODDING & ROGERS P.C.
PO BOX 16370
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73113

EXAMINER	
RAMIREZ, DELIA M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1652	

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/661,049	CUMMINGS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Delia M. Ramirez	1652	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) 1-21 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Application

Claims 1-21 are pending.

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-5, drawn in part to a purified core 1 β3-galactosyl transferase specific molecular chaperone comprising SEQ ID NO: 1, classified in class 530, subclass 350.

II. Claims 1-5, drawn in part to a purified core 1 β3-galactosyl transferase specific molecular chaperone comprising SEQ ID NO: 3, classified in class 530, subclass 350.

III. Claims 1-5, drawn in part to a purified core 1 β3-galactosyl transferase specific molecular chaperone comprising SEQ ID NO: 5, classified in class 530, subclass 350.

IV. Claims 1-5, drawn in part to a purified core 1 β3-galactosyl transferase specific molecular chaperone comprising SEQ ID NO: 7, classified in class 530, subclass 350.

V. Claims 6-14, 17-18, 21, drawn in part to a polynucleotide comprising SEQ ID NO: 2 which encodes a protein having core 1 β3-galactosyl transferase specific molecular chaperone activity, host cells, vectors, and a method to recombinantly produce the corresponding protein, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1.

VI. Claims 6-14, 17-18, 21, drawn in part to a polynucleotide comprising SEQ ID NO: 4 which encodes a protein having core 1 β3-galactosyl transferase specific molecular chaperone activity, host cells, vectors, and a method to recombinantly produce the corresponding protein, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1.

VII. Claims 6-14, 17-18, 21, drawn in part to a polynucleotide comprising SEQ ID NO: 6 which encodes a protein having core 1 β3-galactosyl transferase specific molecular

chaperone activity, host cells, vectors, and a method to recombinantly produce the corresponding protein, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1.

VIII. Claims 6-14, 17-18, 21, drawn in part to a polynucleotide comprising SEQ ID NO: 8 which encodes a protein having core 1 β3-galactosyl transferase specific molecular chaperone activity, host cells, vectors, and a method to recombinantly produce the corresponding protein, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1.

IX. Claim 15, drawn to a method of producing a protein requiring post translational glycosylation having a core 1 structure with host cells transformed with a polynucleotide which encodes a protein having core 1 β3-galactosyl transferase specific molecular chaperone activity, classified in class 435, subclass 69.1.

X. Claim 16, drawn to an in vitro method of galactosylating a protein with a core 1 β3-galactosyl transferase specific molecular chaperone, classified in class 435, subclass 15.

XI. Claims 19-20, drawn to an assay for detecting a condition characterized by the presence of a defective core 1 β3-galactosyl transferase specific molecular chaperone lacking the C-terminal domain of SEQ ID NO: 1, classified in class 436, subclass 86.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Groups I-VIII each comprise a chemically unrelated structure capable of separate manufacture, use, and effect. The nucleic acids of Groups V-VIII comprise purine and pyrimidine units, whereas the proteins of Groups I-IV comprise amino acids, thus being structurally distinct molecules. The nucleic acids of Groups V-VIII have other uses besides encoding the proteins of Groups I-IV, such as a hybridization probe or in gene therapy. Further, the proteins of Groups I-IV can be prepared by processes which are materially different from recombinant expression of the nucleic acids of Groups V-VIII, such as by chemical synthesis, or by isolation and purification from natural sources.

3. The inventions of Groups I-VIII are members of an improper Markush group as the proteins of Groups I-IV and the nucleic acids of Groups V-VIII do not have unity of invention according to MPEP § 803.02. Each of the proteins of Groups I-IV comprise an unrelated amino acid sequence and each of the nucleic acids of Groups V-VIII comprise an unrelated nucleotide sequence. Therefore, each of the proteins of Groups I-IV would elicit different antibodies. Since the proteins of Groups I-IV have different amino acid sequences, the nucleic acids of Groups V-VIII would encode proteins of different structure and can be used to probe different targets. Therefore, there is no unity of invention within the members of the Markush group as there is no shared common utility and there is no shared substantial structural feature disclosed as being essential to that utility.

4. Inventions I-IV and X are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the proteins of Inventions I-IV can be used to elicit antibodies as well as in the in vitro method of Invention X.

5. Inventions V-VIII and IX are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the nucleic acids of Inventions V-VIII can be used to produce the proteins of Inventions I-IV as well as in the method of Invention IX.

6. Inventions I-VIII and XI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case neither the proteins of Inventions I-IV nor the nucleic acids of Inventions V-VIII are used nor made by the assay of Invention XI, which is

an assay which would require a compound (e.g., an antibody) to detect a mutant core 1 β3-galactosyl transferase specific molecular chaperone.

7. Inventions I-IV and IX are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the proteins of Inventions I-IV are neither used nor made by the method of Invention IX, which is a method of use of the nucleic acids of Inventions V-VIII.

8. Inventions V-VIII and X are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the nucleic acids of Inventions V-VIII are neither used nor made by the method of Invention X, which is a method of use of the proteins of Inventions I-IV.

9. Inventions IX-XI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the methods of inventions IX-XI comprise different steps, use different products and produce different results.

10. As set forth in MPEP § 803, the criteria for a proper restriction between patentably distinct inventions requires that the inventions must be independent or distinct as claimed, and a search of all the inventions would impose a serious burden on the examiner. Groups I-XI have been shown to be independent or distinct, for the reasons set forth above. MPEP § 803 also indicates that a serious burden on the examiner may be prima facie shown if the Examiner shows by appropriate explanation either separate classification, separate status in the art, or a different field of search. The inventions of Groups I-XI have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, as shown by their different classification. In addition, a search of all the inventions would require at a

minimum a separate patented/non-patented literature search and a class/subclass search. These searches are not all co-extensive. Therefore a comprehensive examination of all groups would impose an undue burden on the Examiner. Thus, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

11. The Examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

12. In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting

rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

13. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement can be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

14. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

15. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Delia M. Ramirez whose telephone number is (571) 272-0938. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Ponnathapura Achutamurthy can be reached on (571) 272-0928. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Delia M. Ramirez, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1652

DR
March 5, 2006